



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,620	12/08/2003	Janaki Krishnaswamy	021756-003100US	4734

51206 7590 05/01/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
OMOSEWO, OLUBUSOLA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,620	Applicant(s) KRISHNASWAMY ET AL.	
	Examiner OLUBUSOLA ONI	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 8-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 8-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 02/14/2007
2. Claims 1, 2, 3 have been amended. Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mikhailov et al. (Pat No. 6, 968500) hereinafter "Mikhailov"

For claim 1 Mikhailov teaches “a client device configured to receive user input and provide a user interface to a user”([Col. 9, lines 59-67, fig. 2&3])

“a database for storing objects corresponding to the object model and metadata describing the object model”([Col.3, lines 19-52,Col. 4, lines 4-36,Col. 5, lines 19-38, Col. 6, lines 44-59, fig. 1&7A])

“a configuration management module for creating a deployable collection of objects using the object model” ([Col. 5, lines 19-38])

“a validation engine for validating metadata in the database, wherein said validation engine is configured to perform completeness validation applying a completeness validation rule on a validation subject in response to a user entered command to perform validation on the subject, to automatically perform correctness validation applying a correctness validation rule on a validation subject when the subject is created or updated, and to automatically perform completeness and correctness validation on a validation subject when requested by the configuration management module” ([Col.5, lines 39-54, Col. 15, lines 59-Col. 16, lines 24, fig. 10 & 11])

For claim 2, Mikhailov teaches “wherein the validation subject is an instance of one of an attribute, an association, an object and a collection of objects” ([Col. 1, lines 1-31])

For claim 3, Mikhailov teaches “wherein the validation subject is a meta metadata

Art Unit: 2168

object selected from the group consisting of a MetaAttribute, a MetaAssociation, a MetaAssociationEnd, a MetaClass and a MetaCollection”([Col. 5, lines 39-54, Col. 14, lines 62-64])

For claim 6, Mikhailov teaches “wherein the validation subject is a deployable collection of objects from the database” ([Col.5, lines 39-54, Col. 9, lines 43-58])

For claim 7, Mikhailov teaches “wherein the validation subject is an aggregated collection of objects from the database”([Col.5, lines 39-54, Col. 9, lines 43-58])

For claim 8, Mikhailov teaches “creating an instance of a metadata object in response to user input” ([Col. 5, lines 19-38]);

“automatically applying one or more correctness type validation rules to the object instance”([Col. 5, lines 39-54, Col. 14, lines 27-46, Col. 15, lines 14-21])

“if a user selects validation of the object instance, applying one or more completeness validation rules to the object instance”([Col. 5, lines 39-54])

“automatically applying both the one or more correctness validation rules and the one or more completeness validation rules to the object instance prior to deployment of the object instance” ([Col. 5, lines 39-54, Col. 14, lines 27-46, Col. 15, lines 14-21])

For claim 9, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejecting claim 2 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 10, Mikhailov teaches "The method of claim 8, wherein the metadata object is an association and wherein the object instance to which a validation rule is applied includes the two objects associated by the association" ([Col. 1, lines 1-31, Col. 5, lines 39-54, Col. 14, lines 62-64])

For claim 11, Mikhailov teaches " further including automatically applying the one or more correctness type validation rules to the instance if the instance is automatically updated or manually updated" ([Col. 10, lines 29-57])

For claim 12, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejecting claim 2 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 13, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejecting claim 7 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 14, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejecting claim 8 and is similarly rejected.

Response to Argument

5. Applicant's argument filed February 14, 2007 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments. Applicant argued that Mikhailov does not teach "validating metadata". However, applicant admitted that Mikhailov teaches service definition, which is the metadata. Mikhailov's teachings at Col.5, lines 39-49 also states that a service definition provided by the publisher may include form logic for the various data submission fields. The service definition may also include form logic for a valid form submission, and may specify special submission handling instructions, like instructions to email each submission to the form publisher for review before entering the submission into the database table, furthermore the form service definitions may be conveniently saved as metadata associated with the corresponding database table, which indicated that the database table is for saving form logic for a valid form submission, therefore the form service definition (metadata) associated with the database table is a validated metadata of the form logic for a valid form submission.

At Col. 15, lines 59-Col. 16, lines 24, fig. 10 & 11 of Mikhailov's teachings, the form engine (validation engine) queries the metadata of the database table to determine if the publisher review is required, however the publisher review may not be required if each submission has already been emailed to the publisher for review (Col. 5, lines 43-47) however, if the form publisher review is required, the submission will be emailed to the form publisher for review, the form engine (validation engine) proceeds to determine

if the form publisher has approved the data submission for recordation, if not the validation engine (form engine) determines if a revised valid submission has been received. Wherein if a revised valid submission has been received, the submission data will be loaded into the database table. However, as taught in Col. 5, lines 39-49, the service form definition (metadata) associated with the corresponding table will be saved. Therefore the querying the metadata of the database to determine if the form publisher has been review and also to determine if a revised submission has been received is a way of validating the metadata, which is synonymous to applicants teaching of validating metadata.


Applicant also argued that Mikhailov does not teach "applying a completeness validation rule on a validation subject and applying a correctness validation rule on a validation subject". On the contrary, Mikhailov's teachings of the form engine's (validation engine) determination of whether the form publisher review is required at Col. 15, lines 59-Col. 16, lines 14, in other to verify that a valid form submission has been completed. Furthermore, at Col. 15, lines 1-58, Mikhailov teaches the determination of a valid entry and a valid submission. Wherein Mikhailov also teaches if data is not valid, the form engine displays a correction prompt, with the corrected data. Thus applicants teachings of correctness and completeness validation rules are also taught by Mikhailov, however, teachings are synonymous.

CONCLUSION

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 10.00-6.30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

OLUBUSOLA ONI KBP
Examiner
Art Unit 2168